

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln. No. 10/800,986  
Office Action dated January 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated May 31, 2006

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants' attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the thoroughness with which the application has been reviewed and the suggestion of terms which appear to require antecedents, namely principal plane, the body of the workpiece, etc. Such antecedents are to be found either in the preamble or in the detailed text of the newly submitted claims. A plate-like workpiece has a rectilinear principal plane. The body is that portion of the workpiece which is not deformed and to which the lug is joined. The lug obviously has two sides and two ends; one for the inner end is at the juncture with the body.

The original claims have been canceled and new Claims 17-33 have been substituted to cure the objections and also to better define the amended method and structure.

Turning first to the rejection of the claims as anticipated by Ross et al Patent No. 6,079,922, it is respectfully submitted that the method of the present invention as defined in the substitute claims is not disclosed or suggested by Ross et al. Ross is making an internally threaded insert, and starts out with what appears to be a planar workpiece. He ultimately forms a triangular tubular structure by forming three parallel fold lines. He does not cut threads into the workpiece but rather deforms or embosses the metal to produce projections on the surface which comprise partial threads. The ultimate result, is a tubular structure with embossed threads within the body of the structures rather than threaded surfaces cut into the sides of the lugs. It is respectfully submitted that Ross et al does not disclose or suggest such a method.

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln. No. 10/800,986  
Office Action dated January 4, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated May 31, 2006


With respect to the apparatus claims, Ross does not have a thread cutting device but rather an embossing or stamping machine. His "installation" does not produce a structure in which threaded formations are provided along both sides of a lug.

Duncan et al Patent No. 5,780,805 does not cure the basic deficiencies of Ross et al. Applicants will concede that laser cutting machines are old and well known. However, that is not all that is required by either the method claims or the installation claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the substitute claims clearly define a novel and unobvious method for producing threaded lugs on a plate-shaped workpiece, and early allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEFAN BÜTTNER ET AL

By 

Peter L. Costas  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 18,637  
(860) 241-2630